

Rebuttal to the Argument In Favor of Proposition 3

Our economy is in trouble. Families are struggling financially. Our state government cannot balance its books. Now is NOT the time to saddle ourselves, our children and our grandchildren with more debt.

The campaign managers for Proposition 3 know they tug at voters' heartstrings by framing Proposition 3 as "for the children." But the direct beneficiaries are medical supply houses, pharmaceutical companies, hospital administrators, and other special interests. They will receive nearly \$1 Billion of the tax payer's money after "investing" a small amount to qualify and campaign for this initiative. **This is a terrible abuse of the initiative process.**

Those behind Prop. 3 are not telling you another important fact - that unspent funds from the earlier "children's hospital bond" (Prop. 61 in 2004) are still available. Instead of spending the money that voters have already authorized, they are demanding more – even though our economy is struggling, and competition for those dollars is fierce.

Proponents claim: "Proposition 3 does not raise taxes." Who would they have you believe pays the bill? The tooth fairy? This bonds' principle and interest (nearly \$2 billion over 30 years) will be paid for by our children and grandchildren. Soon, either taxes will be raised or other state expenditures, such as schools, law enforcement or parks, will be reduced. There is no "free lunch."

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSITION 3

In these troubled economic times, Californians cannot afford big new spending and the massive debt that comes with it. **Vote NO on Prop. 3.**

SIGNED BY:

Lewis K Uhler	President, National Tax Limitation Committee
Ted Gaines	California State Assemblyman
James V Lacy	Director, American Conservative Union